

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action (“Action”) dated March 12, 2007, Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 19, and 27, and has added new claims 28-30. Support for the amendments and the new claims may be found at least on page 12, line 13 to page 13, line 16, page 16, lines 7-15, page 18, lines 13-18, and page 20, lines 11-17. Claims 1-30 are pending. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

The Action rejects claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by the article “Capacity Planning for Business Intelligence Applications: Approaches and Methodologies” by Hahn et al. (“Hahn”).

A. AMENDMENTS TO CLAIMS 1, 10, AND 19

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

A computer-implemented method for capturing at least one statistic or data regarding performance operation of a business intelligence reporting system that generates business intelligence reports based on requests submitted to perform analysis of data contained in a database, the method comprising the steps of:
gathering at least one statistic or data related to the performance operation of the reporting system while the reporting system is operating;
analyzing the at least one statistic or data; and
generating at least one output based on the gathered at least one statistic or data,
wherein the at least one output includes an alert if the analysis of the at least one statistic or data indicates that a condition has occurred.

Similar claim amendments have been made to independent claims 10 and 19. It is believed that Hahn does not disclose any of the newly added features. Applicant submits that this amendment overcomes Hahn and allowance of claims 1, 10, and 19 is respectfully requested.

B. AMENDMENTS TO CLAIMS 9, 18, AND 27

The amendments to claims 9, 18, and 27 are believed to place these claims in condition for allowance in addition to the reasons given in support of claim 1.

Claim 9 has been amended to recite:

The computer-implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of performing automated tuning of the reporting system based on the at least one output.

Similar amendments have been made to claims 18 and 27. On page 9, the Action cited section 5.1.2 on Hahn (see Hahn, page 66), which discloses that Resource Monitoring Facility (RMF) “reports generated by [a] postprocessor are used for either capacity planning or performance tuning of an OS/390 system.” See Hahn, page 66. Hahn further discusses performance tuning in Chapter 2, section 2.9. Hahn does not, however, appear to disclose a computer implemented method comprising a step of performing automated tuning of a reporting system based on at least one output, where the at least one output is generated based on a gathered at least one statistic or data. Specifically, Hahn discloses that the “effort an organization puts into tuning is dependent on the availability of *skilled resources* versus the cost of additional hardware.” See Hahn, page 33, Section 2.9, second full paragraph; emphasis added. Thus, Hahn does not appear to disclose automated tuning of a reporting system. Therefore, claims 9, 18, and 27 are believed to be allowable over Hahn for reasons in addition to those given in support of claim 1.

C. NEW CLAIMS 28-30

Claims 28-30 have been added in this Response and are set forth above. Claim 28 relates to categorizing at least one statistic or data to configure a frequency of gathering the at least one statistic or data. Claim 29 relates to gathering at least one statistic or data to monitor processing of a cache request. Claim 30 relates to further specifying that executing requests produces two statistics records for the requests that contain prompts. Hahn is not believed to disclose any of these claim features recited in claims 28-30 and hence claims 28-30 are believed to be allowable over Hahn for reasons in addition to those given in support of claim 1.

Therefore, all of claims 1-30 are believed to be in condition for allowance and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that prosecution and allowance of the application will be expedited through an interview, whether personal or telephonic, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with any suggestions leading to the favorable disposition of the application.

Included herewith are the claim fees for three additional dependent claims. It is believed that no additional fees are due for filing this Response.

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION OF MARCH 12, 2007
U.S. PATENT APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 09/884,467
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 53470.003030

The Director is hereby authorized to treat any current or future reply, requiring a petition for an extension of time for its timely submission as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. Applicant also authorizes the Director to charge all required fees, fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.17, or all required extension of time fees, to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

By: 

Christopher M. Swickhamer
Registration No. 59,853

Brian Buroker
Registration No. 39,125

Dated: June 12, 2007
Hunton & Williams LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)